

REMARKS

1. Status of Claims

Claims 1-6, 13-23, and 25-26 were pending in the Application. Applicants have amended claims 1, 6, 13, 15 and 20 without prejudice or disclaimer. Applicants respectfully request entry of the above amendments and consideration of the enclosed remarks. Applicants submit that no new matter is added. Accordingly, claims 1-6, 13-23, and 25-26 will remain pending in the application.

2. Claim Objections

In sections 4-7 of the Office Action, the Examiner objected to claims 1, 6, 13, 15 and 20 for certain informalities.

Solely in order to expedite prosecution, Applicants have amended claims 1, 6, 13, 15 and 20 without prejudice or disclaimer.

Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the objections.

3. Rejections under 35 USC § 112

In section 9 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-6, 13-14 and 25 under 35 U.S.C. §112 as allegedly failing to comply with a written description requirement.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection. However, solely to expedite prosecution, Applicants have amended claim 1 without prejudice or disclaimer and the rejection is moot.

Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection.

4. Rejections under 35 USC § 103(a)

In section 11 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1 – 6, 13-22 and 25-26 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly rendered obvious by U.S. Patent No. US 7,089,288 B2 to Gossweiler, et al. (“Gossweiler ‘288”) in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. US 2005/0131959 A1 by Thorman, et al. (“Thorman ‘959”).

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

With reference to claims 1 and 15, the cited references apparently do not teach or suggest such a physical sensor associated with the user and a physical token. Contrary to the Examiner's assertion on page 9, section 13(a) of the Office Action, Gossweiler '288 apparently describes only a tag associated with a type of action, but not a particular document and not a particular user. See, e.g., Gossweiler '288 at Col. 1, II. 41-54 and Col. 2, II. 9-55. Moreover, the cited portion of the reference relied on at the top of page 10 requires a separate tag to identify the user wherein it states "reading a first tag embedded in a picture identification card to establish user identification, immediately presenting a second tag" Accordingly, Applicants respectfully maintain that the cited reference does not teach or fairly suggest the recited element.

The cited references do not teach or describe a physical sensor associated with the particular token and associated virtual document so that it can report physical interaction such as touch applied to the token, but merely describe id tags and physical items. Moreover, the cited references do not teach or suggest an instrumented association bin. As described in the passage cited by the Examiner at Gossweiler '288, Col. 6, lines 14-36, the reference requires a user to type in associations and does not use an instrumented association bin. The Examiner points at page 10, section 13(c) only to a tag reader and not an instrumented associated bin as presently claimed.

The dependent claims 2-6, 13-14, 16-22 and 25-26 are patentable over the cited references for at least the reasons described herein with reference to the associated independent claim and any associated intervening claims.

Furthermore, with regard to claims 2-6, the cited references do not teach or suggest the sensor model instance as presently claimed.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1-6, 13-22 and 25-26 are patentable over the cited references and respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection.

In section 12 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claim 23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly rendered obvious by U.S. Patent No. US 7,089,288 B2 to Gossweiler, et al. (“Gossweiler ‘288”) in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. US 2005/0131959 A1 by Thorman, et al. (“Thorman ‘959”) and further in view of Want.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection. Claim 23 is patentable over the cited references for at least the reasons described herein with reference to the associated independent claim and any intervening claims.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-6, 13-23 and 25-26 are in condition for allowance and respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejections.

5. Conclusion Of Remarks

For at least the reasons stated above, it is respectfully submitted that the claims of this application are in condition for allowance and early and favorable action thereon is requested.

If the Examiner believes that additional issues may be resolved by a telephone interview, the Examiner is respectfully urged to telephone the undersigned attorney for Applicant at (203) 924-3180.

6. Authorization

No fee is believed due with this response. However, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required for the response or credit any overpayment to the Pitney Bowes, Inc. Deposit Account Number 16-1885, Order No. F-870.

In the event that an extension of time or additional extension of time is required to make this response timely filed, the Commissioner is requested to grant a petition

for that extension of time which is required to make this response timely. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fee for such an extension of time or credit any overpayment for an extension of time to the Pitney Bowes, Inc. Deposit Account Number 16-1885, Order No. F-870.

Respectfully submitted,

/George M. Macdonald/

George M. Macdonald
Reg. No. 39,284
Attorney for Applicants
Telephone (203) 924-3180
PITNEY BOWES INC.
Intellectual Property and Technology Law Department
35 Waterview Drive, MSC 26-22
Shelton, CT 06484-8000